|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4-Point Argumentative Writing Rubric** | | |
| **Score** | **Purpose / Organization** | **Evidence / Elaboration** |
| **4** | **The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:**   * claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task * consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas * effective introduction and conclusion * logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety * alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed | **The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes reasoned analysis and the effective use of facts and details. The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precision language:**   * comprehensive support is integrated, relevant, and specific * effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques * vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose * effective, appropriate style enhances content * effectively credits source material, including characterizing its credibility * appropriate use of paraphrasing, quotation marks or signal phrases distinguishes between the students’ own ideas and source material |
| **3** | **The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident. The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus.**   * claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task * adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify the relationships between and among ideas * adequate introduction and conclusion * adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas * alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed | **The response provides adequate support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes reasoned analysis and the use of facts and details. The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:**   * adequate support is integrated and relevant, yet may be general * adequate use of some elaborative techniques * vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose * generally appropriate style is evident * adequately credits source material, including addressing its credibility * appropriate use of paraphrasing, quotation marks or signal phrases distinguishes between the students’ own ideas and source material |
| **2** | **The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident. The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:**   * claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose, audience, and task * inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety * introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak * uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between among ideas * alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged | **The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of facts and details. The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:**   * support may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied * weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques; development may rely on emotional appeal * vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose * inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style * rarely credits source material or characterizes the credibility of the source material or author * inconsistent or weak use of paraphrasing, quotation marks or signal phrases distinguishes between the students’ own ideas and source material |
| **1** | **The response has little or no discernible organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:**   * Claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose, audience, or task * few or no transitional devices are evident * introduction and/or conclusion may be missing * frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression * alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged | **The reason provides minimal support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes little or no use of facts and details. The response’s expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:**   * support is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominately copied * minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques; emotional appeal may dominate * vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose * little or no evidence of appropriate style * minimally gives credit or addresses credibility of source material * little or no evidence of distinguishing between the students’ own ideas and source material |